

*Senate Budget and Fiscal Review*  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

EDUCATION  
Jack Scott, Chair  
John Vasconcellos  
Bob Margett

**Monday March 3, 2003**  
**1:30 p.m. — Room 113**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. <u>Higher Education Overview</u></b>	
<i>California Community Colleges, Chancellor Tom Nussbaum</i> <i>California State University, Chancellor Charles Reed</i>	
<b>II. <u>Hastings College of Law</u> .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. <u>California Postsecondary Education Commission</u> .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. <u>University of California – Capital Outlay</u> .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>V. <u>Community Colleges – Capital Outlay</u> .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VI. <u>Student Aid Commission</u> .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VII. <u>Consent</u> .....</b>	<b>11</b>

### **Item 6600 – Hastings College of Law**

The Governor's Budget proposes a total 2003-04 General Fund budget of \$11.383 million for Hastings College of Law; included in this amount is an ongoing \$1 million unallocated reduction beginning in the current year.

**GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL.** The Governor proposes \$4.087 million in both unallocated and targeted budgetary reductions in 2003-04. Included in this proposal is an additional \$2.031 unallocated base reduction and reductions targeted at the following programs and services: Replacing visiting professors with adjunct professors (\$579,000); reducing staff development (\$251,000); reducing the amount of support available for law library materials and scholarly journal acquisitions (\$130,000); eliminating funds for the replacement of capital equipment (\$51,000); and reducing travel costs for students participating in Moot Court (\$46,000). Further, the Governor's Budget assumes that \$4.5 million in student fee revenue will be available -- due to proposed student fee increases -- to offset the proposed reductions.

**STUDENT FEE INCREASES.** In contrast to the University of California, which increased fees for law students in December, Hastings chose not to impose an increase on students mid-year. For 2003-04, Hastings proposes to increase fees for *new* students by 35 percent (this amount corresponds to the increase proposed for UC law school students) but intends to mitigate the impact on continuing students by imposing a lesser, 28 percent, fee increase. According to Hastings, the amount of the fee increase will allow the college to recoup all but 7 percent of the proposed reductions. However, staff notes that a 7 percent reduction is significantly greater than the General Fund reductions (approximately 4.5 percent) being imposed on the UC or CSU, **before** factoring in student fee increases at those segments.

*Staff recommends that reductions for Hastings be examined at a level equivalent to the reductions taken by the other higher education institutions. Further, staff recommends that, regardless of the level of reduction, the cuts be designated as "unallocated" rather than targeted at specified programs.*

### **Item 6420 – California Postsecondary Education Commission**

**GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL** The Governor's 2003-04 Budget for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) proposes General Fund expenditures of \$695,000 and federal fund expenditures of \$5.33 million for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. This represents a General Fund decrease of \$1.5 million, or 69 percent, from estimated current-year expenditures. (Note: The Legislature rejected the Governor's December proposal to decrease current year funding for CPEC by \$108,000).

As part of the Governor's proposal, the budget eliminates 23.5 staff positions and related operating expenses and equipment, leaving five positions (three of which are funded with General Fund and include the Director, Executive Secretary and Postsecondary Education manager in the External Affairs Unit; the remaining two positions are funded with federal funds and include the Chief Associate and the Office Technician in the Federal Programs unit).

While the Administration proposes to substantially reduce the budget of CPEC, it does not (as of yet) propose any change to the statutory responsibilities of the organization; DOF would note that it intends to work with CPEC in the future to determine the focus of its responsibilities in light of a significantly reduced budget.

**DETERMINING ROLE OF CPEC.** As part of last year's budget process, the Legislature expressed its interest in trying to determine the role of CPEC by requesting that the Legislative Analyst convene a working group to develop recommendations concerning the alignment of CPEC's responsibilities to its overall funding level. The final report, entitled *The California Postsecondary Education Commission: A Review of Its Mission and Responsibilities*, was recently issued by the Analyst with the input of the working group and is now available from the Office of the Legislative Analyst. The LAO notes that its report was "informed" by the discussions of the working group, since the group was unable to reach consensus on many of the issues.

In summary, the LAO determined that there is indeed a mismatch between CPEC's statutory responsibilities and their budgeted resources that needs to be aligned, first by determining where CPEC should focus its efforts/resources and then determining a funding level appropriate to those activities. Further, the LAO noted that there is an inherent "tension" between CPEC's role as an independent analyst and a coordinator of higher education information and policy. Specifically, the LAO believes that it is difficult for CPEC to serve both as a part of the higher education system's infrastructure while also serving as an objective analyst of that same structure.

*Staff notes that the question before the committee appears to be:* How does the legislature better align CPEC's responsibilities with its level of funding; and in particular, what tasks and responsibilities does the legislature want/need from CPEC and what are the costs associated with those responsibilities.

If the committee instead chooses to determine a dollar figure first (as in the case of the Governor's Budget), the LAO notes that, if the appropriation level for CPEC is to be reduced to \$695,000, it would be most useful for CPEC to focus its limited resources in the area of data collection and management.

### **Item 6440 – University of California – Capital Outlay**

**GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL** The Governor's Budget proposes to fund 37 University of California capital projects (17 previously approved projects and 20 new projects) using \$307.5 million in General Obligation Bonds approved by the voters in November of 2002.

**RESEARCH SPACE.** Of the 37 projects, the LAO singles out two, and recommends their deletion based on concerns regarding the amount of research space already available on the campus (the remainder of the projects are proposed for consent). Based on its own examination of research space at 100 universities throughout the county, the LAO found that the UC has a significantly greater proportion of research space than the amount of space found in what it deems to be

comparable institutions. Staff notes that the data used by the LAO for this examination appears to be substantially different from the research space standards available from CPEC. Specifically, staff is unclear how one would draw comparisons given that the LAO's data contains research space associated with the health sciences (CPEC's does not) which has the potential to severely distort the data. Nor is it clear how the LAO is able to compare 100 universities nationwide to the University of California system, when at least 85 percent of the institutions on the list would likely be defined as "minor" research institutions when compared to the UC.

In response, the University of California, along with the Department of Finance and CPEC note that UC adheres to the facilities planning and space utilization guidelines, first adopted by CPEC in the 1970's and revised in the early 1990's, related to the amount of research space appropriate to the institution and/or discipline. While these guidelines were never codified, staff notes that they have been generally accepted amongst all parties (with the exception of the Legislative Analyst).

Specifically, the Legislative Analyst recommends deletion of the following two projects (the remainder of the capital outlay projects are proposed for consent):

- **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES UNIT 3 BUILDING.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$3.080 million for preliminary plans and working drawings be deleted from the proposed 2003-04 budget because, according to the Analyst, the campus already has enough research space. Future costs for the project are expected to be \$52.3 million for construction and equipment. *Staff recommends that the project be approved as budgeted.*
- **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO. MAYER HALL ADDITION AND RENOVATION.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$2.072 million for preliminary plans and working drawing be deleted from the proposed 2003-04 budget because the campus has more research space than justified. Total cost for the project, including construction and equipment is expected to be \$40 million. *Staff recommends that the project be approved as budgeted.*

### **Item 6870 – California Community Colleges – Capital Outlay**

**GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL** The Governor's 2003-04 Budget proposal includes \$562 million in General Obligation Bond funds, approved by the voters in November of 2002, for 62 previously-approved and 35 new projects.

Of the 97 projects, the Legislative Analyst recommends that the following four projects be deleted from the proposed 2003-04 budget due to the following overarching concerns (the remainder of the capital outlay projects are proposed for consent). In each case the Community College Chancellor's Office has a prepared (and written) response to the LAO's concerns:

- **CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT – LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE. MATH, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY BUILDING.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$716,000 for preliminary plans be deleted from the proposed budget because (1) there is already enough classroom space on campus (regardless of summer term enrollment); (2) the campus is underutilized in the summer; (3) the proposal assumes unrealistic student enrollment growth (and hence a demand for classroom space) over a one year time span; and (4) the campus did not adequately evaluate the option of renovating existing space. Total cost for the project is expected to be \$21.3 million, including planning, working drawings, construction and equipment.
- **LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT – LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE. INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY CENTER, MANUFACTURING.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$698,000 for preliminary plans and working drawings be deleted from the proposed budget because (1) the campus is underutilized during the summer term and (2) the campus did not adequately consider renovating existing facilities to meet their programmatic needs. Additional project costs include \$9.9 million for construction and equipment.
- **LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT – EAST L.A. FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$15.9 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment be deleted from the proposed budget because the campus did not fully evaluate the option of renovating existing facilities. The \$15.9 million cost represents half of the total project cost, which is expected to be approximately \$31.8 million; the remainder of the funds are coming from nonstate sources.
- **LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT – LA HARBOR COLLEGE. APPLIED TECHNOLOGY BUILDING.** The Legislative Analyst recommends that \$613,000 for preliminary plans and working drawings be deleted from the proposed budget because (1) the campus did not fully evaluate the option of renovating existing facilities; (2) there is already enough instructional space on the campus; and (3) student enrollment in the campuses applied technology programs (and campus enrollments in general) declined by 1,000 FTE from 1982 to 2001. Total cost for the project is expected to be approximately \$17.6 million, with half that amount coming from nonstate sources.

### **Item 7980 – California Student Aid Commission**

**GOVERNOR’S BUDGET PROPOSAL.** The Governor’s 2003-04 Budget proposes a total of \$1.4 billion in expenditures (\$699 million General Fund) for the California Student Aid Commission, which reflects a \$78 million or 13 percent increase above estimated current-year expenditures.

<b>Figure 1</b>				
<b>Student Aid Commission</b>				
<b>General Fund Budget Summary</b>				
<i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>				
	<b>2002-03 Revised</b>	<b>2003-04 Proposed</b>	<b>Change From 2002-03</b>	
			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>State Operations</b>	\$9.9	\$7.7	-\$2.2	-22%
<b>Local Assistance</b>				
New Cal Grant entitlement awards	\$263.1	\$424.3	\$161.2	61%
New Cal Grant competitive awards	88.6	104.4	15.7	18
Existing awards	225.0	130.0	-95.0	-42
Subtotals, Cal Grant awards	(\$576.7)	(\$658.7)	(\$82.0)	(14%)
Cal Grant C awards	\$12.1	\$8.9	-\$3.2	-26%
Cal Grant T awards	6.0	3.0	-3.0	-50
APLE <sup>a</sup> program	20.5	30.0	9.5	46
Graduate APLE program	0.2	0.5	0.3	130
Work study	5.3	—	-5.3	-100
Law enforcement scholarships	0.1	0.1	0.1	103
Federal Trust Fund <sup>b</sup>	-9.5	-9.5	—	—
<b>Totals, local assistance</b>	<b>\$611.3</b>	<b>\$691.7</b>	<b>\$80.4</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>\$621.3</b>	<b>\$699.4</b>	<b>\$78.2</b>	<b>13%</b>
<sup>a</sup> Assumption Program of Loans for Education.				
<sup>b</sup> Federal Trust Fund monies directly offset Cal Grant program costs.				

Specifically, the Governor's Budget proposes an increase of \$82 million (14 percent) over the current year expenditures for the Cal Grant Program. Following are the adjustments to the Cal Grant Program proposed by the Governor. (1) Augment the Cal Grant A and B programs to cover proposed student fee increases at the University of California and California State University (\$43 million); (2) increase the total number of Cal Grants available (by 41,045 for a total of 234,485 new and renewal grants) based on new estimates of eligible high school graduates, transfer students and renewal applicants (\$49 million); and (3) decrease the maximum Cal Grant award level for students attending private institutions (\$10.2 million).

Other adjustments to the Student Aid Commission's budget include a \$9.5 million increase in the funding available for the Assumption Program of Loans for Education Program (APLE). This funding adjustment is due to an increase in the number of students redeeming previously approved loan forgiveness warrants in the coming year.

<b>Figure 2</b>		
<b>Eligibility Criteria for Cal Grant Entitlement Program</b>		
<b>2002-03</b>		
<b>Eligibility requirement</b>	<b>Cal Grant A</b>	<b>Cal Grant B</b>
Minimum high school GPA	3.0	2.0
Minimum transfer GPA	2.4	2.4
Income ceiling, by family size <sup>a</sup>		
Six +	\$76,500	\$42,000
Four	66,200	34,800
Two	59,400	27,800
Asset Ceiling <sup>a</sup>	\$51,200	\$51,200
<sup>a</sup> Represents ceilings for dependent students and independent students with dependents other than a spouse. A family's asset level excludes its principal residence.		

### ***Budget Issues/Action Items:***

1. **REDUCE THE MAXIMUM CAL GRANT AWARD FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS (-\$10.2 MILLION).** Depending on the type of educational institution a Cal Grant recipient elects to attend, the amount of the Cal Grant A or B award varies. The award is “valued” at the cost of mandatory systemwide fees at the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU), while students attending private colleges receive up to \$9,708 (in the current year) to assist in the payment of their tuition.

The Governor’s Budget proposes to reduce the maximum Cal Grant award for student attending private colleges by 9 percent, generating \$10.2 million in General Fund savings. The maximum award amount would thus be reduced from its current level of \$9,708 to \$8,832 for new Cal Grant recipients. Renewal recipients would continue to receive their awards at the current level of \$9,708. The Legislative Analyst recommends that the Legislature reject the Governor’s proposal to reduce the Cal Grant award for students attending private colleges because these awards, in many cases, may provide the state with fiscal advantages and strengthen educational accountability among public universities. Staff notes that a decrease in the maximum award level will likely result in more students being dependent upon student loans.

2. **TUITION AND FEE ASSISTANCE TO FIRST-YEAR CAL GRANT B RECIPIENTS (\$95 MILLION).** Current law provides that students receiving a Cal Grant B award receive a subsistence stipend of \$1,551 during their first year of college; in the second, third and fourth years, the student receives both the stipend and financial aid to cover student fees and/or tuition (up to the maximum award level of \$9,708 for students attending private institutions). The LAO does note that current law allows for up to 2 percent of the Cal Grant B recipients to receive tuition/fee assistance in their first year, but only for the most financially needy and academically meritorious of the Cal Grant B recipients. The LAO is recommending that this policy be

changed and that funds be appropriated to provide fee/tuition assistance to first-year Cal Grant B recipients.

Initially, when the original Cal Grant B program was established, there was an assumption that fee/tuition assistance in the first year wasn't necessary. At that time the law required that a specified percentage of Cal Grant B recipients attend a community college, where, given a students' financial need, their fees would be waived under the Board of Governor's (BOG) Fee Waiver Program. When the Cal Grant program was revamped into an entitlement program (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2000) the new statutes failed to include a fee/tuition component in the first year, due primarily to the costs (approximately \$95 million) associated with the change. While a significant number (approximately 42 percent) of the Cal Grant B awards are still granted to community college students, 32 percent are awarded to students attending a CSU campus; 19 percent to UC students; and 8 percent to students attending private institutions.

3. **REDUCE THE CAL GRANT C PROGRAM (-\$3.2 MILLION).** The Cal Grant C program provides financially-needy students preparing for vocational or occupational careers with tuition/fee assistance (up to \$2,592) as well as additional support (up to \$576) for training-related costs such as tools, books, and supplies. Unlike the Cal Grant A and B programs, which require students to be pursuing a baccalaureate degree, the Cal Grant C program is the only state-supported grant program that provides funds to students enrolled in shorter-term vocational programs. Of the Cal Grant C participants, approximately 60 percent are enrolled at the Community Colleges; the remainder attend private vocational schools.

The Governor's 2003-04 Budget proposes to decrease funding for the Cal Grant C program by \$3.2 million or 26 percent. This would reduce the total number of awards by 3,040 (from 10,730 to 7,690; of this amount 4,125 are renewal awards and 3,565 would be available for new recipients.)

*Staff notes that this is the only financial aid program targeted at short-term vocational training. Given the current condition of the state's economy, which tends to result in an increased need for vocational training, staff recommends that the reductions proposed by the Governor be denied.*

4. **REDUCE THE CAL GRANT T PROGRAM (-\$3.0 MILLION).** The Cal Grant T program provides tuition and fee funding for financially- and academically-eligible students to attend a teacher credentialing program. Recipients are required to teach for one year in a low-performing school for each \$2,000 received, for a maximum period of four years. Any recipient who does not fulfill the teaching obligation is required to repay the award.

The Governor's budget provides \$3 million for the Cal Grant T program, which is 50 percent less than the estimated current-year expenditures. This would reduce the number of awards by 540 (from 1,390 to 850). The LAO notes that since its inception, the Cal Grant T program has



never been fully subscribed. Whereas the Commission was authorized to fund 3,000 awards in 2001-02, only 1,739 students utilized the program. In 2002-03, the state reduced the Cal Grant T appropriation to better align it with expenditures. While the LAO does not make a specific recommendation related to this program, they do note that there are a variety of sources of financial aid for would-be teachers. For example, the state already funds the Assumption Program of Loans for Education (APLE) program, as well as providing Cal Grant recipients with aid for a fifth year of study if they enroll in a teacher preparation program. Further, the Analyst points out that the federal government also funds two loan-forgiveness programs for teachers.

*In light of the similarities between the Cal Grant T program and the APLE program, as well as the availability of other teacher-related financial aid opportunities, staff recommends that the entire Cal Grant T program be repealed and that no new awards be granted in 2003-04. Further, staff notes that \$1 million would need to be retained in the program to continue providing grants to those students already receiving awards.*

5. **PROPOSED BUDGET BILL LANGUAGE TO DECREASE THE NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED APLE WARRANTS IN 2003-04.** The APLE program seeks to encourage individuals to pursue careers in teaching by issuing warrants (commitments to pay) and then forgiving \$11,000 in college loans if they teach full time in a public K-12 school for four consecutive years. Teachers may receive an additional \$4,000 in loan forgiveness if they teach in a subject-shortage area (such as mathematics, science or special education), or if they teach in a school ranked in the bottom two deciles of the Academic Performance Index. Individuals who elect to teach in both a targeted school and a targeted subject area can have up to \$19,000 in college loans forgiven. In all cases, the student must have accrued student loan debt in order to reap the benefits of this program.

The Administration proposes to decrease the number of APLE warrants issued in 2003-04 by 1,000 (from 7,500 to 6,500 which is the same number of warrants authorized in 2001-02). The savings associated with this decrease would not be realized for at least two years, given that students must first complete their teacher preparation program and then teach in the classroom for one year before loans begin to be repaid.

*In light of the above-noted staff recommendation on the Cal Grant T program, staff recommends that the Governor's proposal to reduce the number of authorized APLE warrants be denied, thus keeping the program at its current level (at no cost to the state in the Budget Year).*

6. **ELIMINATE THE CALIFORNIA WORK-STUDY PROGRAM (-\$5.3 MILLION).** The California Workstudy Program assists students by placing them in employment settings which will enable them to pay a portion of their educational costs. Under this program, the state and the employers each pay for a portion of the students' salaries. Recipients are placed in jobs either (1) related to their course of study or career interest, or (2) providing tutoring to elementary or secondary school students. The program currently operates at 40 institutions and provides support to over 3,000 students. In 2002-03, the Student Aid Commission notes that all the funds for the program

will be used. The Governor's 2003-04 Budget proposes to eliminate the state's Work Study Program, thereby achieving \$5.3 million in General Fund savings. Staff notes that, without this financial aid option, students will be more dependent upon student loans.

### Consent

Staff recommends that the following items be Approved as Budgeted. No issues have been raised with regard to any of these items:

6420-001-0890. Support, California Postsecondary Education Commission. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$338,000

6420-101-0890. Local Assistance, California Postsecondary Education Commission. Federal Eisenhower Professional Development Program. \$5,002,000

6600-001-0814. Support, Hastings College of Law. California State Lottery Education Fund. \$157,000

6600-301-6028 Capital Outlay, Hastings College of Law. Preliminary plans and working drawings for 200 McAllister Street Building seismic, fire and life-safety improvements as well as an upgrades to the HVAC system and various code compliance issues. \$1,875,000.

UC Capital Outlay projects (see attached spreadsheet)

CSU Capital Outlay projects (see attached spreadsheet)

Community Colleges Capital Outlay projects (see attached spreadsheet)

7980-101-0890. Local Assistance, California Student Aid Commission. Payable from the Federal Trust Fund. \$9,481,000

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**2003-04 Budget for Capital Improvements**  
**Governor's Budget**  
**(\$ in Thousands)**

**Items for Consent**

**Funding Request**

**BERKELEY**

Doe Library Seismic Corrections, Step 4	PWC	16,920
---	-----	--------

**DAVIS**

Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science	W	600
Seismic Corrections -- Phase 4	PW	574

**IRVINE**

Computer Science Unit 3	C	29,089
Central Plant Chiller Expansion, Step 5	PWC	18,800

**LOS ANGELES**

Kinsey Hall Seismic Correction, Phase 2	C	17,387
Electrical Distribution System Expansion, Step 6B	C	6,228
Boelter Hall Fire Sprinkler System	PWC	5,081
Campus Fire Alarm System Upgrade, Phase 3	WC	2,654
Campbell Hall Seismic Correction	PW	534
Geology Seismic Correction	PW	978

**MERCED**

Site Development and Infrastructure, Phase 3	C	12,799
Castle Facilities Improvements	C	3,000
Logistical Support/Service Facilities	PW	874

**RIVERSIDE**

East Campus Infrastructure Improvements	PWC	8,400
College of Humanities and Social Sciences Instruction and Research Facility	PWC	31,227
Psychology Building	PW	2,241

**SAN DIEGO**

Pharmaceutical Sciences Building	C	24,714
Campus Emergency Services Facility	C	3,987
Biomedical Library Renovation and Addition	C	14,503
West Campus Utilities Improvements	C	3,940
Student Academic Services Facility	W	1,172
Satellite Utilities Plant, Phase 1	PW	647
Applied Physics and Mathematics Renovation	PW	845

**Funding Request**

**SAN FRANCISCO**

Health Sciences West Improvements, Phase 1	C	12,934
Medical Sciences Building Improvements, Phase 2	P	1,400

**SANTA BARBARA**

Psychology Building Addition and Renewal	C	9,817
Snidecor Hall Office Wing Seismic Replacement	C	10,566
Biological Sciences Buildings Renovation	PW	1,000
Education and Social Sciences Building	PW	4,116

**SANTA CRUZ**

Seismic Corrections, Phase 2A	WC	3,000
Humanities and Social Sciences Facility	WC	25,826
Emergency Response Center	WC	6,592
Alterations for Engineering, Phase 2	PW	396
McHenry Project	P	3,602

**ANR**

Desert REC Irrigation Water System	PWC	763
------------------------------------	-----	-----

**UNIVERSITYWIDE**

Northern Regional Library Facility, Phase 3	C	16,177
---	---	--------

**TOTAL**

---

**303,383**

**2002 General Obligation Bond Funds**

**300,383**

**1998 General Obligation Bond Funds**

**3,000**

---

P = Preliminary Plans  
W = Working Drawings  
C = Construction

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

FY03/04 Capital Outlay

**Consent List**

<b>Item:</b>		<b>Requested</b>	<b>At Issue</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<b>6610-301-6028</b> For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2002				
(1) 06.48.315	Systemwide: Minor Capital Outlay Program, Preliminary plans, working drawings and	6,194,000		6,194,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>6,194,000</b>		<b>6,194,000</b>
 <b>6610-302-6028</b> For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2002				
(1) 06.52.109	Chico: Student Services Center, Working drawings and construction	32,840,000		32,840,000
(2) 06.56.092	Fresno: Science II Replacement Building, Equipment	1,958,000		1,958,000
(3) 06.76.101	Sacramento: Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase 1, Preliminary plans, working drawings and	18,691,000		18,691,000
(4) 06.78.092	San Bernardino: Science Buildings Renovation/Addition, Phase II, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	21,786,000		21,786,000
(5) 06.80.157	San Diego: Social Sciences/Art Gallery/Parking Structure 8, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	25,384,000		25,384,000
(6) 06.86.115	San Jose: Joint Library-Secondary Effect, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	19,633,000		19,633,000
(7) 06.90.085	Sonoma: Darwin Hall, Preliminary plans, working drawings and construction	26,012,000		26,012,000
(8) 06.92.064	Stanislaus: Science II (Seismic), Working drawings and construction	45,696,000		45,696,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>192,000,000</b>		<b>192,000,000</b>
<b>Total Consent List</b>		<b>198,194,000</b>		<b>198,194,000</b>

# California Community Colleges

## Proposed Capital Outlay Spending Plan

### 2003-04

#	District	College	Project Name	Category	Ph.	Amount
1	Allan Hancock CCD	Allan Hancock College	Library/Media Tech Center	B	ce	9,079,000
2	Allan Hancock CCD	Allan Hancock College	Science Health Occupations Complex	B	pw	1,109,000
3	Barstow CCD	Barstow College	Remodel for Efficiency	E	pw	266,000
4	Butte-Glenn CCD	Butte College	Learning Resource Center	B	ce	17,280,000
5	Cerritos CCD	Cerritos College	Seismic Retrofit-Administration	A-3	c	2,080,000
6	Cerritos CCD	Cerritos College	Science and Math Complex - Life Safety	A-2	e	432,000
7	Chabot-Las Positas CCD	Las Positas College	PE Gym - Phase I	D-1	ce	12,496,000
8	Chabot-Las Positas CCD	Las Positas College	Multi-Disciplinary Education Building	B	pw	701,000
9	Chaffey CCD	Chaffey College	Science Bldg.	A-2	e	64,000
10	Coast CCD	Golden West College	Structural Repair Campuswide	A-4	pw	199,000
11	Coast CCD	Orange Coast College	Learning Resource Center	B	pw	1,024,000
12	Compton CCD	Compton College	Performing Arts and Recreation Complex	D	pw	825,000
13	Contra Costa CCD	Diablo Valley College	Life Science Remodel for Laboratories	B	ce	5,041,000
14	Contra Costa CCD	Los Medanos College	Learning Resource Center	B	ce	8,176,000
16	Contra Costa CCD	San Ramon Valley Center	Phase I Bldg.	B	ce	24,609,000
17	Copper Mountain CCD	Copper Mountain College	Multi-use Sports Complex	D	pw	885,000
18	Foothill-De Anza CCD	De Anza College	Planetarium Projector	F	e	1,000,000
19	Foothill-De Anza CCD	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Campus Center	A-3	wc	11,438,000
20	Foothill-De Anza CCD	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Student Services	A-3	c	3,606,000
21	Foothill-De Anza CCD	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Field Locker Room	A-3	pw	132,000
22	Foothill-De Anza CCD	Foothill College	Seismic Replacement-Maintenance Building	A-3	pw	68,000
23	Fremont-Newark CCD	Ohlone College	Child Development Center	A-2	e	251,000
24	Glendale CCD	Glendale College	Allied Health /Aviation Lab	B	ce	9,196,000
25	Glendale CCD	Glendale College	New Science Building Equipment	B	e	735,000
26	Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCI	Cuyamaca College	Science & Technology Mall	B	ce	18,349,000
27	Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCI	Grossmont College	New Science Bldg.	B	ce	12,141,000
28	Hartnell CCD	Hartnell College	Library/Learning Resource Center Complex	B	ce	20,198,000
29	Kern CCD	Bakersfield College	Applied Science and Technology Modernization	C	c	4,017,000
30	Kern CCD	Porterville College	Library Expansion	B	pw	507,000
31	Kern CCD	Delano Center	Lab Building	B	ce	4,965,000
32	Kern CCD	Southwest Center	Modernization Phase I	C	c	2,636,000
33	Lake Tahoe CCD	Lake Tahoe Community College	Learning Resource Center	B	ce	7,133,000
37	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Mission College	Child Development Center	D-1	ce	5,432,000
38	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Southwest College	Child Development Center	D-1	ce	4,482,000

# California Community Colleges

## Proposed Capital Outlay Spending Plan

### 2003-04

#	District	College	Project Name	Category	Ph.	Amount
39	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Trade Tech Co	Child Development Center	D-1	ce	3,851,000
40	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Valley College	Health Sciences Building	B	ce	14,214,000
41	Los Rios CCD	American River College	Learning Resource Center Expansion	B	ce	9,065,000
42	Los Rios CCD	American River College	Allied Health Modernization	C	c	1,724,000
43	Los Rios CCD	Consumnes River College	Instructional & Library Facilities 1	B	c	6,753,000
44	Los Rios CCD	Sacramento City College	Technology Building Modernization	C	c	1,562,000
45	Los Rios CCD	El Dorado Center	New Instructional & Library Facilities 1	B	ce	5,896,000
46	Los Rios CCD	Folsom Lake College Center	New Instructional Space Phase 1C	B	c	10,749,000
47	Merced CCD	Merced College	Science Building Remodel	B	pw	1,048,000
48	Merced CCD	Los Banos Center	Site Development and Permanent Facility	B	pw	1,032,000
49	Mira Costa CCD	Mira Costa College	Horticulture Project	D	ce	3,356,000
50	Mt. San Antonio CCD	Mt. San Antonio College	Science Bldg. Replacement	A-2	e	326,000
51	Mt. San Antonio CCD	Mt. San Antonio College	Remodel Classroom Buildings	C	pwce	8,982,000
52	North Orange County CCD	Cypress College	Library/Learning Resource Center	B	ce	13,396,000
53	North Orange County CCD	Fullerton College	Library/Learning Resource Center	A-2	e	402,000
54	Palo Verde CCD	Palo Verde College	Technology Bldg. Phase II	B	ce	7,881,000
55	Palo Verde CCD	Palo Verde College	Physical Education Complex	D	pw	806,000
56	Peralta CCD	Vista College	Vista College Permanent Facility	B	ce	28,533,000
57	Rancho Santiago CCD	Santa Ana College	PE Seismic Replacement/Expansion	D	ce	5,524,000
58	Rancho Santiago CCD	Santiago Canyon College	Science Building	B	pw	773,000
59	Riverside CCD	Riverside City College	Martin Luther King High Tech Center	C	ce	8,711,000
60	Riverside CCD	Moreno Valley Center	Child Development Center	D	ce	2,090,000
61	Riverside CCD	Norco Valley Center	Child Development Center	D	ce	2,233,000
62	San Bernardino CCD	San Bernardino Valley College	Child Development Center	A-2	e	125,000
63	San Francisco CCD	Mission Center	Mission Center Building	B	ce	28,557,000
64	San Francisco CCD	Chinatown Campus	Campus Building	B	ce	33,180,000
65	San Jose-Evergreen CCD	San Jose City College	Science Building	A1	ce	12,535,000
66	San Luis Obispo CCD	Cuesta College	Theater Arts Bldg.	D-1	ce	11,665,000
67	San Luis Obispo County CCD	North County Center	Initial Bldg.. - Science Cluster	A-2	e	1,650,000
68	San Luis Obispo County CCD	North County Center	Learning Resource Center	B	pw	702,000
69	Santa Barbara CCD	Santa Barbara City College	Gymnasium Remodel	B	ce	3,701,000
70	Santa Barbara CCD	Santa Barbara City College	Physical Science Renovation	A-4	pw	159,000
71	Santa Clarita CCD	College of the Canyons	Classroom/High Tech Center	B	ce	8,878,000
72	Santa Monica CCD	Santa Monica College	Liberal Arts Replacement	B	pwce	4,458,000



# California Community Colleges

## Proposed Capital Outlay Spending Plan

### 2003-04

#	District	College	Project Name	Category	Ph.	Amount
73	Sequoias CCD	College of the Sequoias	PE & Disabled Program Center	D	pw	505,000
74	Sequoias CCD	College of the Sequoias	Science Center	B	ce	10,586,000
75	Shasta Tehama Trinity Jt C	Shasta College	Library Addition	B	ce	6,919,000
76	Sierra Jt. CCD	Sierra College	Construct New Classroom/Labs	B	pw	1,301,000
77	Sonoma County CCD	Petaluma Center	Petaluma Center, Phase 2	D	pw	1,669,000
78	Sonoma County CCD	Santa Rosa Jr. College	Learning Resource Center	B	ce	31,935,000
79	South Orange County	Irvine Valley College	Performing Arts Center	D	pwce	14,472,000
80	Southwestern CCD	Southwestern College	Child Development Center	D-1	ce	5,322,000
81	Southwestern CCD	Southwestern College	Learning Assistance Center	C	pw	2,367,000
82	State Center CCD	Fresno City College	Applied Technology Modernization	C	pw	962,000
83	State Center CCD	Reedley College	Learning Resource Center Addition	B	ce	5,498,000
84	State Center CCD	Vocational Training Center	Vocational Training Center Modernization	C	p	777,000
85	Ventura County CCD	Moorpark College	Child Development Center	D-1	ce	2,901,000
86	Victor Valley CCD	Victor Valley College	Speech/Drama Studio Addition	D	pw	591,000
87	West Hills CCD	West Hills College	Library Expansion	B	ce	2,117,000
88	West Hills CCD	Lemoore College	Phase 2B Classrooms/Laboratories	B	ce	9,730,000
89	West Hills CCD	Lemoore College	Child Development Center	D	ce	1,902,000
90	West Kern CCD	Taft College	Child Development Center	D	pw	221,000
91	West Valley-Mission CCD	West Valley College	Campus Technology Center	B	pw	791,000
92	West Valley-Mission CCD	Mission College	Main Building 3rd Floor Reconstruction	B	ce	4,323,000
93	Yosemite CCD	Modesto Junior College	Auditorium Renovation/Expansion	D	pw	1,026,000
94	Yuba CCD	Yuba College	Adaptive Physical Therapy	A-2	e	44,000
95	Yuba CCD	Yuba College	Engineering, Math & Science	C	pw	685,000
96	Yuba CCD	Woodland Center	Science Building	A-2	e	714,000
97	Yuba CCD	Woodland Center	Learning Resources/Technology Center	B	pw	1,908,000
						<b>\$ 562,244,000</b>